

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected. Claim 1 is herein amended by importation of the limitations of claim 2. Claim 2 is canceled. Claims 3 and 5 are herein amended to correct dependency.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koide (U.S. Patent No. 6,554,644 B2) in view of Yamaguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,975,950).

The Examiner admits that Koide lacks a cantilevered retaining beam, an engaging hole corresponding to a retaining pawl and the cylindrical shape housing, but that Yamaguchi includes these elements. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the connector of Koide by providing a cantilevered retaining beam, the retaining pawl as taught by Yamaguchi for locking the housing to the central contact and change the rectangular shape of the housing to be a cylindrical shape; since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component.

Applicants herein amend claim 1 by importation of the limitations of claim 2, which is canceled. Subsequently, Applicants disagree with the rejection of the claims, because not all of the claimed limitations are taught or suggested by the cited reference.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that it would have been obvious to modify the connector of Koide by adding a second retaining beam, a second engaging hole corresponding to the second retaining pawls as taught by Yamaguchi for securing the central contact to the housing on both sides; since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Applicants specifically disagree with the Examiner's standard to determine obviousness. The Examiner improperly cites *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.* to state that "mere duplication of essential working of a device involves only routine skill in the art." However, the Examiner is apparently citing *In re Harza*, 669 F.2d 669, which is different from the present case.

Applicants submit that the present case is not merely duplicating a feature of a cited reference. The present claim 1 (formerly claim 2) recites "a pair of engaging holes (15, 15) formed in opposed side wall portions of the central contact (1)," and "a pair of retaining beams (35, 35) formed on opposed side wall portions of the insulating housing (3)..." By reciting not only the number but also the location of the engaging holes and retaining beams, Applicants are not merely claiming a duplication of a feature of a cited reference, but an additional feature and a different effect as well. That is, by locating the beams and holes on opposing sides, as claimed, the presently claimed arrangement provides an effect such that if the central contact were to move laterally away from engagement of one hole and beam with the housing, the engagement of the other hole and beam becomes even stronger and therefore less likely to fail. Such effect would not inherently be seen with a mere duplication of parts. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the combination of cited references, even if the references were properly combined.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, the Examiner admits that Koide lacks a second engaging lance corresponding to a second engaging stepped portion.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the connector of Koide by adding a second engaging lance corresponding to a second engaging stepped portion on the other side wall for securing the external contact to the housing on both sides; since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection for essentially the same reason as the discussion above with respect to the rejection of claim 1 (former claim 2). That is, the present case is not merely duplicating a feature of a cited reference. The present claim 1 (formerly claim 2) recites “a pair of engaging holes (15, 15) formed in opposed side wall portions of the central contact (1),” and “a pair of retaining beams (35, 35) formed on opposed side wall portions of the insulating housing (3)...” By reciting not only the number but also the location of the engaging holes and retaining beams, Applicants are not merely claiming a duplication of a feature of a cited reference, but an additional feature and a different effect as well.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Attorney Docket No. 032115  
Serial No. 10/720,160

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Kenneth H. Salen  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 43,077

KHS/lde  
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 822-1100

Q:\2003\032115\032115 Amendment 8-23-04.doc